PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEA	DOLUNIO ALITU	VODEDIOTEN	1.9.05 4.7.05					
	HCHING AUTHO	JAIIT		DCT				
To:				PCT				
		AKTE:	NOT: (5					
see form	PGT/ISAcazeose Patentanwell	& Große le Hechtsenwälte	WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORIT					
	2 8. A	PR. 2005 0000	(1	PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1)				
	Bearbeiter:	54	Date of mailing (day/month/year) se	e form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)				
Applicant's or agent's file see form PCT/ISA/2			FOR FURTHER A					
International application PCT/EP2004/01320		International filing date (c	day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 21.11.2003				
		both national classification	and IPC					
C07K7/06, A61K47/	48, C12N15/62							
Applicant				•				
ORTHOGEN AG			.,,					
<u></u>		ons relating to the folk	owing items:					
Box No. II	☑ Box No. I Basis of the opinion □ Box No. II Priority							
☐ Box No. III								
⊠ Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention							
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement								
☐ Box No. VI	Certain docum	ents cited	plication					
☐ Box No. VII	Certain defects	s in the international app						
☐ Box No. VIII	Certain observ	rations on the internation	al application					
2. FURTHER ACT	ION .							
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.								
submit to the IPI	EA a written repl date of mailing	ly together, where appro	priate, with amendme	IPEA, the applicant is invited to ents, before the expiration of three a of 22 months from the priority date,				
For further optio	ns, see Form Po	CT/ISA/220.						
3. For further detai	ls, see notes to	Form PCT/ISA/220.						
Name and mailing addre	ss of the ISA:		Authorized Officer					

European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Groenendijk, M

Telephone No. +31 70 340-3715



40/579941 IAP20 Rec CFC//PTO 22 MAY 2006
International application No.
PCT/EP2004/013203

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

		Box No. I Basis of the opinion						
	1.	 With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item. 						
This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of internationa (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).								
	2.	With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:						
		a. type of material:						
		\boxtimes	a sequence listing					
)			table(s) related to the sequence listing					
		b. format of material:						
		×	in written format					
		×	in computer readable form					
	c. time of filing/furnishing:							
		\boxtimes	contained in the international application as filed.					
		⊠	filed together with the international application in computer readable form.					
			furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.					
	3.	İ	n addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.					
	4.	4. Additional comments:						

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/013203

		x No. III Non-establishment oblicability	of op	inion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial			
	The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:						
		the entire international application,					
	Ø	claims Nos. 37,39,41,44-53,55,57,59,62					
	bec	pecause:					
	⊠	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 37,39,41,44-53,55,57,59,62 relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):					
`		see separate sheet					
)		the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):					
		the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.					
	☒	no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 1-63(a partially)					
		the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Ani C of the Administrative Instructions in that:					
		the written form		has not been furnished			
				does not comply with the standard			
		the computer readable form		has not been furnished			
				does not comply with the standard			
`·		the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.					
		See separate sheet for further	detai	ds.			

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/013203

	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of	invention				
1.	⊠ In resp		-		6) to pay additional fees, the applicant has:		
	□ paid additional fees.						
		paid additional fee	s under pro	otest.			
		not paid additional	fees.				
2.	This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.						
3.	This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is ☐ complied with ☐ not complied with for the following reasons:						
1							
!							
	see separate sheet						
4.	Consequently, this report has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:						
	□ all parts.						
ا	⊠ the part	s relating to claims	Nos. 1-63(all partially)		
	Box No. V industrial	Reasoned state applicability; citati	ment und ions and e	er Rule 43 explanation	bibis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or ns supporting such statement		
1.	Statement						
	Novelty (N)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-63		
	Inventive s	tep (IS)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-63		
	Industrial a	applicability (IA)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-36,38,40,42,54,56,58,60,61,63		
2.	Citations a	nd explanations					

see separate sheet

10/579941

AP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 22 MAY 2006

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/EP2004/013203

Re Item III.

1)Claims 37,39,41,44-53,55,57,59,62 relate to subject-matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1(iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of these claims (Article 34(4)(a)(I) PCT).

2)In response to an invitation to pay additional fees as to lack of unity (see Section IV) the applicant has not paid any fee. Consequently only subject 1 has been searched and hence can be examined.

Re Item IV.

()

)

The separate inventions are:

Inventions 1-39

Delivery peptide respectively comprising an amino acid sequence defined by SEQ ID Nos. 1-39; expression cassette as defined in claim 4, complexes as defined in claim 7 and their use as far as relating to respectively SEQ ID Nos 1-39

They are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (Rule 13.1 PCT) for the following reasons:

The following documents are cited for the purpose of this reasoning:

D1:WO-A-02069930

D2:Mol.Cells, Vol.13, 2002, 202-208

D3:WO-A-0115511

- 1)Reading the claims in the light of the description the problem to be solved could initially be considered to be the provision of compounds which can be used for delivery of active agents through body membranes.
- 2) This problem has been solved by a plurality of solutions as defined in respectively the

independent claims 1-3. The application further relates to compositions/constructs of said compounds with active agents and their (medical) use.

- 3) This plurality of solutions might, a priori, be considered as satisfying the requirements of unity in which the structural features of formula I provides the special technical feature linking these different solutions.
- 4)However at the filing date of the application identical compounds also for use in delivery of active agents through body membranes were already known as can be illustrated by D1-D3 (actually claim 1 encompasses 39000 known compounds!):
- a)D1, see particularly page 21 and example 13;
- b)D2, see particularly the abstract

()

- c)D3: see particularly Table 1, peptides 3-5,7,12,13,21.
- 5)In the light of these documents, the ISA considers that a common technical link based on the structural features of formula I, which could be the unifying concept, is no longer present.
- 6)The objective problem could therefore be considered to be the provision of alternative compounds for the use of delivery of active agents through body membranes.
- 7)Therefore further unified solutions should relate to (groups of) compounds sharing a common structural element which may be regarded as the special technical feature providing unity; this special technical feature should be an essential structural part common to all of the embodiments of the claimed invention (and responsible for the inventive effect), and which is absent from any solution to the same problem disclosed in the prior art.
- 8)Regarding all of the proposed solutions as a whole, as defined in claims 2 and 3, no common novel invariant structural features can be detected which could be considered as special technical feature providing unity to the application.
- 9)As no other technical features can be distinguished which, in the light of the prior art, could be considered as special technical features on which a unifying concept could be based, there is lack of unity between the plurality of claimed inventions defined in the claims of the present application (Rule 13.1 PCT). A subdivision according to structure has been made.

Only subject 1 has been searched completely.

Re Item V.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/EP2004/013203

The following documents are referred to in this communication:

D1: WO 02/069930 A (CELLGATE, INC) 12 September 2002 (2002-09-12)

D2: Molecules and Cells, vol. 13, no. 2, 30 April 2002 (2002-04-30), pages 202-208,

XP009016372 ISSN: 1016-8478

I.Novelty

}

In view of the available prior art the amino acid sequence SEQ ID No. 1, delivery peptides comprising it and their constructs are novel. Hence the claims 1-63 fulfil the requirements of Art.33(2) PCT.

II.Inventive step

- 1)The closest prior art can be considered to be represented by D1, disclosing peptides which are used for delivery of active agents through body membranes. Exemplified are, inter alia the peptides RKKRRQRRR, RKKRRQRR, RKKRRQRR, KKRRQRRR AND KRRQRRR (see example 13).
- 2)The delivery peptides of the application are characterized by comprising an amino acid sequence KKRKKQKKRK and consequently differ structurally from said prior art. Said peptides also exhibit the activity of transporting active agents through body membranes.
- 3)The problem to be solved may therefore be considered to be the provision of alternative peptides to be used as delivery peptides.
- 4) Having regard to the structural similarity of the present compounds to those disclosed in D1, the examiner is of the opinion that a skilled person would expect the present compounds to exhibit, at least qualitatively, the same activity as the prior art compounds. It is true that the present compounds contain a larger content of lysine residues. However D2 already disclosed that also peptides consisting entirely of lysine residues exhibit the same activity. Hence an artisan would not expect that introduction of lysine residues in the compounds of D1 would result in complete loss of activity.

Hence the present delivery peptides are considered to be merely obvious modifications of the compounds of D1, which a skilled person would be able to provide in order to solve the problem posed. Therefore inventive step can only be acknowledged if the present compounds exhibit unexpected advantageous properties. However at present said properties have not been posed nor have they become plausible otherwise.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

()

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/013203

Consequently the claims 1-3 are considered to lack inventive step under Art.33(3) PCT.

The related and/or dependent claims 4-63 do not contain features which in combination with the subject-matter of the claims they refer to would provide inventive step and therefore also are considered to contravene Art.33(3) PCT.

For the assessment of the present claims 37,39,41,44-53,55,57,59,62 on the question whether they are industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist in the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize as industrially applicable the subject-matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, claims to a known compound for first use in medical treatment and the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.